

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/722,508	LUNT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Taghi T. Arani, Ph.D.	2131	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Taghi T. Arani, Ph.D. (3) _____

(2) Kurt P. Goudy (4) _____

Date of Interview: 29 December 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 10.


Identification of prior art discussed: _____

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


TAGHI T. ARANI
EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant's representative discussed and clarified main feature of the invention as a proposed amendment. Specifically, he explained what distinguishes the proposed amendemnt from the cited prior art s not teaching a computerized policy as proposed in claims 1 and 10. Although the examiner agreed that the cited prior art does not disclose a computerized policy, but no agreemnet was reached as to the allowance of the application untill further search on formal response to the office action is received .